

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorial—Advertisements.

MONDAY, AUGUST 14, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 110 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: 110 Nassau Street, New York. Telegrams: Tribune, New York. Cable: Tribune, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York: Daily, 1 mo., \$1.00; 3 mos., \$2.50; 6 mos., \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Single copies, 5 cents.

FOREIGN RATES: Daily, 1 mo., \$1.50; 3 mos., \$3.50; 6 mos., \$6.00; 1 year, \$10.00. Single copies, 10 cents.

CANADIAN RATES: Daily, 1 mo., \$1.00; 3 mos., \$2.50; 6 mos., \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

"Pitiless Publicity" in Action.

Mr. Hughes started on his "cross-continent speaking trip" on August 5. Just one week later came the announcement that President Wilson, who had expected to conduct a quiet and peaceful "front porch" campaign at Shadow Lawn, had decided to stump the country in defense of his Administration, following closely the Hughes itinerary.

It required exactly five days of Mr. Hughes's straightforward, sincere and vital presentation of his case against Mr. Wilson's Administration to change the President and his advisers from complacent, contented officeholders to anxious, apprehensive politicians. In that short time Mr. Vance McCormick's patronizing commentary on Mr. Hughes's speeches gave place to the agonized protests of Mr. Bryan and Secretary Redfield against the accusation that Democracy's representatives had been successful rather than as patronage grabbers than as statesmen.

"I'd like to have about six months to investigate this Administration," exclaimed Mr. Hughes in one of his recent speeches. He is able to do good service to the country without such special opportunity to reveal the shortcomings of the Democrats, for he has presented with force and clarity that challenge attention an arraignment of the Wilson Administration's weakness, ignorance, extravagance and selfishness which has left it shaking. His cold, merciless analysis of Mr. Wilson's ever-changing Mexican policy has swept aside the "he kept us out of war" plea for votes, and has left clinging to the President's shoulders the responsibility for a "very ignoble war." His discussion of Democratic appropriations has punctured the hypocrisy of their talk of economy, and has disclosed to the country an era of extravagance, of money-wasting and money-grabbing for political purposes hitherto unequalled. Himself clean of any payroll plundering and paying of political debts with public money, he has revealed debauching of the public service for the benefit of "deserving Democrats."

Mr. Bryan calls this criticism "vile and disgusting." Truly, it is not gentle and gracious work thus to exhibit the sores of Wilsonism, but it is necessary if the country is to choose wisely between the candidates on Election Day. The Wilson Administration has made its record—a record of brave words, but of some deeds which do not look good in print. The "pitiless publicity" which Mr. Wilson promised for the acts of his Administration has long vanished, along with his belief in civil service reform, the initiative, referendum and recall, a tariff for revenue only, and Mr. Bryan. Mr. Hughes as Governor was one who not only preached pitiless publicity but made his deeds jibe with his words. The country may rest assured that he has not changed in fitting deeds to words any more than he has in believing that the public should have all the facts. In both respects he stands superior to his opponent.

A Censor's Museum.

The main purpose in establishing a war museum at the postal censor's office in London was probably to influence neutral opinion, to persuade those who murmur at interference with neutral mails that by no other means is it possible to cope with the efforts of ingenious Germans to avoid by all sorts of devices the full consequences of the blockade.

Samples of many thousands of packets of rubber show an astonishing variety of tricks intended to deceive the inquisitive examiner or to put him off his guard. The most obvious is a newspaper or magazine roll containing sheet rubber or rubber in some form or other. But that is, of course, readily detected, and more complicated means have been devised to catch the censor unawares. Thus, a packet of pure rubber is made to look like a bundle of narcissus bulbs and considerable quantities are sent out in exact imitation of a well known make of golf balls. But the commonest plan of all is to send thin sheets of rubber in letters, in the hope, perhaps, that letters would be examined with less care than the parcel post. Thousands of such letters were seized, and in many cases it was found that they had double covers, the outer envelope being addressed to a neutral whose duty it was to forward the contraband article to Germany.

Many of the newspaper bundles contain calico bags, containing a great variety of articles, from Para rubber to rice, tobacco, tea, oatmeal, lard, or even sliced ham. One heavy bundle of German-American papers concealed two pounds of coffee, another packet, apparently intended only to convey a photograph, was fortified with bars of nickel. One of the most remarkable of all the articles exhibited was a wrapper cov-

ering fifteen pounds of bacon, with stamps to the value of \$4.

The exhibition is altogether a remarkable testimonial to the effectiveness of the blockade, a testimonial which it would take a fleet of Deutschland to annul.

The Conspiracy Against Sleep.

The eminent restaurateur of Broadway who saw a German conspiracy in the complaint of an inhabitant of a nearby apartment house, follows the sound military theory of always attacking. But the move is tactical solely. Everybody in New York not congenitally and totally deaf knows that the one great conspiracy of our metropolis is against sleep. There is neither nationality nor politics in this campaign that never ends. Such sweet strains as this particular restaurant sheds upon surrounding apartment house dwellers may be French or Chinese. They help swell the great bang-whang, boom-ter-rang in which, night and day, New Yorkers possess their souls.

"An early-morning madhouse that ought to be put into a deep, wood far from human habitation," was what the complainant called this particular restaurant before the magistrate. But why swallow all the unnumbered miscellaneous hoots and toots and clangs and tinkles that fill our atmosphere and strain at one madhouse? No doubt this particular form of bedlam keeps going a little longer and earlier. But all noise is relative, and we have no doubt that if the present uproar persists for a few generations especially thick and insensitive ear drums will develop corresponding to the callous spots we already wear upon our souls—and what New Yorker, even now, could sleep in genuine, utter silence?

No. New York is already and everywhere, and all around the clock a madhouse in respect of noise and nobody can rightly complain.

A Jutland Mystery.

As it is evident that several circumstances in the recent engagement off the coast of Jutland were not accounted for either in Sir John Jellicoe's dispatch or in the official reports published in Germany, so in all independent attempts to reconstruct the battle critics are obliged to employ hypotheses in filling up the hiatuses and explaining such incidents as have not hitherto been explained by those who witnessed them. It is significant that in Sir David Beatty's report of the proceedings of the battle-cruiser fleet there is no indication to show when or how the Indefatigable and Queen Mary were sunk, while in the unofficial narratives which have passed under the eye of the censor there is a hint of conscious suppression, as if certain facts concerning the sinking of these as well as the third battle-cruiser were purposely withheld, perhaps for fear of giving useful information to the enemy.

Thus Mr. Pollen, while making it clear that both were blown up at a very early stage of the engagement, intimates that he is not at liberty to enter into "the true explanation," adding that "the Admiralty, no doubt, will give this to the public if it is thought wise to do so."

When the first meagre accounts of the battle reached this country a conclusion commonly drawn was that the advanced squadrons had been caught in a trap. It was the obvious explanation of the loss of the battle-cruisers, and it was also put forward by several critics abroad. All of them seem now to have abandoned it in the light of further evidence, but it appears that many naval officers here still cling to it as the most reasonable explanation, and dismiss the explanations offered by Sir John Jellicoe, Sir David Beatty and all British, French and Japanese seamen as biased, if not, indeed, deliberately invented to excuse a gross tactical blunder.

Their belief is simply this: That the Germans led the British battle-cruisers on a course of their own choosing over submarines or mines placed in position for that very purpose. On no other ground, they say, is it possible to account for the loss of two such units in the first half hour of the action. Mr. Pollen's express statement that neither torpedoes nor mines had any part in the matter is apparently accepted as evidence that they had.

What was the tactical blunder that led to this lamentable disaster? According to these censors it was nothing less than a reckless abandonment of one of the first principles of warfare, which is to bring to bear upon the enemy at the point of contact a greater force than he can put in opposition. What Sir David Beatty ought to have done, they hold, was instantly to turn northward toward the main fleet. Thus he would have effected concentration, and had the Germans failed to follow they would have been obliged to acknowledge that they declined action, thereby greatly enhancing the prestige of the British navy, to the manifest prejudice of their own moral. The case is so simple that any one who offers to think otherwise must, they conceive, be utterly ignorant of the very elements of naval tactics.

It is true that the case is simple, so simple that we are surely justified in assuming that Sir David Beatty must have had something else in mind. Let it be remembered that when he first met the Germans they turned south, evidently trying either to escape or to lead him into danger. He must have been very well aware of the risk he ran in following, very well aware that it would have been safer to steer to the northward. But had he not followed the Germans, the main fleets, as Sir John Jellicoe has pointed out, would never have been in contact. Is it not safe, then, to assume that his object was to draw the enemy, as he put it himself, into the jaws of the British fleet? He had six battle-cruisers, against Hipper's five, and had he done what some tacticians say he ought to have done, is there any reason to believe that he could have accomplished his purpose? Is there any reason why Hipper with his inferior squadron should have followed?

The tactical considerations on which off-

hand condemnation of Sir David Beatty are based are really a little too elementary to be altogether convincing. There is an abundance of examples in naval history for the subordination of obvious tactical truisms to strategic considerations, and it is by no means clear that in this case Sir David Beatty was excessively hot-headed or that the results did not justify his action. It is inconceivable that if the losses of the Germans come near Sir John Jellicoe's estimate they can possibly regard the result with complacency. But, it may perhaps be urged, the circumstances were such that they were able to claim a victory. True; but they claimed a victory with no less assurance after the disastrous engagement off the Dogger Bank in January, 1915.

In conclusion, censure is undoubtedly justified if we must accept Captain Sims's opinion that the British had no business to invite a general fleet action or to attempt the destruction of the German fleet, "because they already had as complete control of the sea as would have resulted from the defeat of the enemy fleet." On the opposite side we have the opinion of some English enthusiasts that a British naval commander is obliged to attack incontinently against any odds. That absurd belief in a non-existent tradition may be dismissed as unworthy of serious consideration, but we can dismiss it without accepting Captain Sims's singular argument, though that argument be amplified by trite tactical maxims.

Preparedness for Epidemics.

In the course of some observations on the current outbreak of poliomyelitis, Dr. Charles E. North makes a plea in "The Medical Record" for the establishment of a bureau of epidemiology. He holds that with all our elaborate machinery for the administration of sanitary measures we are nearly always at a loss in dealing with epidemic diseases, and that in the history of this city it would be easy to point to "instances after instance of this sort of unpreparedness."

Excellent in other respects, our Department of Health is, he thinks, singularly weak in this, for where it "has not entirely missed the discovery of the true cause of an epidemic, the outbreaks recorded have pursued their course uninterrupted, and in some instances for weeks, and even months, unannounced."

With regard to the present condition, he points out that the emergency measures adopted were at first manifestly inadequate, for while great emphasis was laid on the cleaning of streets, the disposal of garbage and sanitation generally, it was a month before any steps were taken for the control of contact cases—an obvious precaution, since the disease is unquestionably contagious and contact infection is indeed the only well established means of transmission.

It is in the hope of providing against the usual panicky and unsystematic way of dealing with such emergencies that he proposes a special department of epidemiology, which he thinks should be organized "just as a fire department is organized." That is to say, with a perfect alarm system and a force sufficient for speedy and well directed action when the occasion comes.

"Such an organization," he says, "might well be included within the regular Department of Health, but so connected with the various special departments, such as the diagnostic laboratory, statistician, research laboratories, sanitary inspection service, disinfection service, etc., that all of these departments can be instantly swung into line, not aimlessly, but as instruments in the hands of the epidemiologist."

It may be objected that such a department would be condemned to considerable periods of relative inactivity, but, as he observes, the same objection might be made with equal justice against the Fire Department; besides, there would be work enough to do in preparing against epidemics all too certain to prevail in the future. Thus, steps might even now be taken against the influenza of next winter, the scarlet fever, measles and whooping cough of next spring.

One good result of such preparedness would undoubtedly be a calmer and more sober spirit on occasions of emergency. When we were overtaken by a new epidemic we should not all lose our heads and behave as if it were the only disease that ever threatened the community.

Governor Hanly's Unique Gesture.

(From The Boston Herald.) Governor Hanly is a man of a single gesture. His left hand is the anvil, his right hand the hammer. He presented Fairbanks in a speech of tedious length. The great convention was unsympathetic. It was eager for him to get through.

After he had pounded down his truths for some time a group of waggish individuals, led by Colonel Frank Knox, then a delegate from Michigan and now editor of "The Manchester (N. H.) Union," began to chorus with the speaker in the hammer and anvil gesture. It was not long before every time Hanly brought his right hand down on his left 500 other persons were doing so, and eventually 5,000. This turned his solemn passages into an occasion of unmixing merriment, until our own Senator Lodge, the chairman of the convention, was obliged to interrupt the speaker to call the house to order, even threatening to clear the galleries.

We should accordingly advise Mr. Hanly in his appearances on the stump in this campaign to develop some diversity in gestures. In this respect he could take our own former Governor as a model. While he has never enjoyed any technical instruction in elocution, he speaks with ease, using no gesture which any of his hearers can remember or describe. That is a fundamental of oratory—to use the gesture so naturally that everybody forgets its presence.

Obstinate Folly.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In hanging Sir Roger Casement the present British government has deliberately played in the hands of Germany. It is one of the most incredible acts of obstinate folly that ever was committed by any body of men calling itself a government.

BERTRAND SHADWELL. Chicago, Aug. 10, 1916.

REGRET FROM AN ANTI

Mr. Hughes Has Given Prominence to a Movement Fundamentally Wrong.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Such prominence has been given to the question of woman suffrage by the advocacy of the Federal amendment by Mr. Hughes that I feel it my duty to express my regret for the stand taken by him on the question, which so vitally affects not only the women, but the Constitution of the United States.

I cannot see the justice in forcing a Federal amendment upon states which have given such overwhelming majorities against any question as have been given against woman suffrage. Would a successful candidate for office or those who elected him consider it just and fair that, in spite of the wishes of the majority who have elected him to office, a minority are to say that his defeated opponent should occupy the position rightfully belonging to him?

Would Mr. Hughes, for instance, if he won the election by a large majority, be satisfied to retire in favor of Mr. Wilson if the latter's supporters made enough noise and disturbance about it?

If a cause is right, why not win a fair victory in a fair way? State by state, that is all we ask who oppose it.

This is a question not of "men against women," but of a different viewpoint among women themselves. The women who are opposed feel they are fighting for the protection of their homes, their sex and their country. Women oppose this dangerous movement because they know that it is fundamentally wrong—and a thing fundamentally wrong can never be right.

The men voted at the recent elections as their women asked them to vote. The suffragists were given every opportunity to prove their case to the electorate. No obstacles were placed in their path. They asked the legislators not to decide it, but to allow the people to vote on it. The voters have expressed their will in no uncertain terms. Now the suffragists wish to override that will and try to get their way through the source they once scorned to have decide it.

The amusing part is to see the suffragists clinging for power to their present "non-partisanship"—the very thing we claim we will lose as women, if we are thrown into politics. The tremendous power that women now hold will be lost forever with all women either Republicans or Democrats.

This idea of a "woman's vote" would be ludicrous if it were not so pathetic to see how some who should know better actually believe in it. What woman would allow another woman, or body of women, to dictate to her? She might allow a man to do so, but not a woman.

And, by the way, where are the men? CLARA VEZIN. Chairman of the Executive Committee of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Elizabeth, N. J., Aug. 11, 1916.

Funeral Moving Pictures.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I have noticed in the papers recently several protests against the suggestive and oftentimes immoral scenes introduced into otherwise high-class motion pictures.

I add my protest. Are acts of libertinism pleasing to the majority of people? I wish further to protest against the death and burial scenes that occur in nine out of ten of the motion pictures.

Why is nothing left to the imagination? The last terrible moments, the ghastly faces on the pillows, the drawing up of the cover and the weeping of the relatives; often the digging of the grave and the mourners around the mound—all these details are minutely carried out. Do motion picture audiences enjoy having their emotions played upon in this way (or have they no emotions)?

Can it be that scenario writers and the men who produce motion pictures have never been bereaved themselves that they portray so glibly these harrowing scenes? After a great loss in my own family the two of us who are left have lately taken to motion pictures to get away for a while from our sorrows. But in nearly every picture we are confronted by these scenes of illness and death.

It seems to me that life is cruel enough to most people at times without having the knife turned in their wounds by motion pictures, which should be a pleasant diversion. J. W. TOWNSEND. Newark, N. J., Aug. 9, 1916.

A Dangerous Political Body.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Comment on "Stanch Kaiserist's" second letter seems unnecessary. "The dangerous political body" he mentions, "which will hold the balance of power in this country and be able to dictate its policies," may be more than a boast. If already a fact, as some believe, it is an argument for an American blacklist, political, social and economic.

We have beheld "Kaiserist" made secure in asking for a list of the convictions of German-American citizens for crimes against the neutrality of the United States, crimes for which it is significant that they have been tried, and equally significant that they have been acquitted. Our present government gave out that it would not act concerning England's blacklist, and then the Secretary of State made haste to declare this purely domestic measure "an unwelcome interference with the rights of our citizens." The action of this force upon our government has been detailed in "The Congressional Record" by a statesman of courage—Senator Paul O. Hastings. His speech of April 27 in the Senate—"Our Foreign Policy"—is worth obtaining from the Government Printing Office.

I am not "an Englishman resident in America" except as that residence was taken up prior to the Revolution by an ancestor. I number Americans of German ancestry among my friends. We are of that large body of Americans who agree, not disagree, with "Kaiserist" when he says that his "dangerous political body" will not "inure to the benefit of the country." We take this body seriously, not as a threat, but as an indication that our previous preoccupation with business has been unfortunate. Cornwall, N. Y., Aug. 10, 1916. R.

The Unspeakable Chinese.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Mr. A. Miller Wilson, in The Tribune of August 9, suggests that a book in the New York Public Library which "runs the Scotch down to the ground" should be removed from the shelves of the library. There is a book on the shelves of the New York Public Library entitled "The Citizen of the World," by an English writer named Oliver Goldsmith, which criticizes the Chinese.

"In defence of a good people" I demand that this pernicious book be removed from the shelves of all public libraries. ISING LEE. Long Island City, Aug. 10, 1916.

THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY.



GERMAN ATROCITIES

Judge Nippert's Attempt to Excuse Them Unconvincing.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In reply to Judge Nippert's many misstatements re German atrocities, would refer your readers to the able and truthful report of Viscount Bryce, former British Ambassador to the United States, who, with a committee, went to Belgium to investigate the horrible atrocities committed on those helpless people. I wish you had the space to spare to mention some more of the horrible butcheries, the brutal violation of young and old women which are mentioned in that report, copies of which can be procured in this city. I will merely mention one case as an example of many others.

The rector of the Louvain University, the Vice-Rector Bishop Dr. Becker, whom I know personally, president of the American Seminary (part of the university), who was formerly Bishop of Wilmington, Del.; Monsignor Williamson, an American priest, together with 140 priests and ecclesiastics, were sent to Brussels in old, dirty carts, seated on bags of potatoes, etc. On reaching Turvin, a suburb of Brussels, they searched the priests, and in the pocket of Father Dupireux they found on a flyleaf a private note giving a description of the destruction of the university with its priceless library, St. Peter's Church and a great many buildings. When the paper had been read and translated, there was silence for a minute. Father Dupireux asked to be allowed to receive absolution. "Absolution! What is that?" was the brutal reply. He answered, "To see a priest." They assented. A priest advanced. Father Dupireux knelt down and the priest heard his confession and gave him absolution.

"Thirty yards from us," says the priest who related the brutal assassination, "Father Dupireux was ordered to halt. Front of soldiers were lined up ten yards in front of us. The order to fire was given. For two minutes. The father's arm still moved; the victim was dispatched by a bullet in the temple and buried."

This is related by Father Schill, an eminent Jesuit priest, who was one of the party and witnessed this horrible murder. Judge Nippert reports that the beautiful Hotel de Ville (City Hall) of Louvain was not burned. This was no fault of the German vandals, as they set it on fire several times, but each time the fire was extinguished.

Judge Nippert writes of the so-called atrocities of the Goetzacks in Eastern Prussia, which is unbelievable, and an glad an American lady, a resident of Poland, the wife of a Russian nobleman, has written under her own name the unprintable outrages of the German soldiers while in occupation of her section and the terrible condition she found her home in after the brutes left it.

If the Germans were successful they would be a menace to the world. Now is the time for Rumania, Holland and Scandinavia to join the Allies, which would enable heroic little Denmark to recover the rich provinces of Holstein and Schleswig, which the Germans stole from her. The destruction of her largest merchant steamer was an act of war against Holland. It is an historical fact that at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown among the twenty-eight flags surrendered fourteen were German.

I hope our people are not forgetting that large numbers of Hessians were hired for money to fight against us in the Revolutionary War, and that Baron Steuben was merely a soldier of fortune who joined our army for all the money there was in it.

We have been dining and wining the officers and crew of the Goetzack and the I am afraid we are forgetting the atrocious murder of 115 men, women and children on board the Lusitania, who were sent to their death without any warning, and even now they are dropping bombs from the Zeppelins on the sleeping women and children of our kinsmen in England. Is this legitimate warfare? No, it is deliberate murder!

In to-day's papers I find a threat from a correspondent that when the Germans are victorious the United States will be brought to account for helping the Allies with ammunition.

I have lived in Belgium for ten years, and one of my daughters still lives in Brussels.

Where Every Dollar Counts.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: As attention has been recently drawn to the case of an organization for war relief work in which it would appear that the funds collected were alleged to have been applied in toto to the collector's private account, rather than to the purpose for which they had been donated, it may not be amiss to refer to a pleasing contrast presented by the Surgical Dressings Committee, located at 299 Fifth Avenue.

Here is an organization headed by Mrs. Mary Hatch Willard and Miss Carita Spencer, with Miss Anne Morgan as treasurer, which, without having solicited a penny (a trifling voluntary contributions have drifted in), without any executive salaries or overhead expenses whatever, with a payroll of perhaps \$35 a week for postage, office help and packing room labor (no wages over \$10 a week), has made up and shipped some seven million surgical dressings to the hospitals of the Entente Allies of the European war, all at not a cent of expense to the recipients.

These women have now been asked by the New York State State of the American Red Cross to assist them in procuring necessary surgical dressings for our field and base hospitals at the Mexican border, to the end that our own men may not be lacking in them in case of necessity. The labor for these dressings can be supplied without cost, but the materials will in this case have to be bought, and there is no money at hand for the purpose.

Will not the public contribute it without special solicitation, which would cost something by way of collection expenses? Donations should be sent to Miss Anne Morgan, at 299 Fifth Avenue. Every dollar will go into the purchase of raw materials and for no other purpose.

BURCHAM HARDING. New York, Aug. 9, 1916.

Learning Out of School.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Will Harry Boroff kindly inform a long suffering public how he performs the miracle of keeping ahead of his lessons, gaining high marks, etc., as he states, although attending school only about half time? Perhaps his method will prove to be the relief for which we are seeking. If children can do so well out of school, why should any of us condemn our offspring to the unnatural conditions and slow, tortuous routine of the public schools by compelling them to daily attendance and permitting them to be imposed on with two or three hours' home work besides, the trend of which is surely causing them to hate studies and in some cases creating mental inability to study at all? Maybe some of us will gladly embrace the Jewish faith if by so doing we can save our children alive.

L.S.R. Brooklyn, Aug. 9, 1916.

GERMAN PROPAGANDA

Hope for a New Kind in Place of That Which Failed.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In a letter which appears in to-day's Tribune Mr. Shields includes my name among the German propagandists in this country. I wish to rectify any wrong impression left in the minds of some of your readers by stating that I am neither in the pay of the German government nor connected with an organized propaganda.

The criticism and satire bestowed by Mr. Shields on the German propagandists seem hard in so far as they work under government orders and swim against an adverse current. They do their very best under most trying circumstances. They ransack, day by day, the press from Boston to New Orleans and San Francisco in order to keep the Official Press Bureau and Foreign Office in Berlin informed about the state of current American opinion. They fill economic archives with valuable newspaper clippings, and even plan a cultural department which might serve as a basis for the future betterment of American relations with Germany.

I can hear Mr. Shields object: But do not these armchair theorists forget that the American press more than any other in the world works up and recasts rather than reflects public opinion, which in a young community consisting of a motley crowd of nationalities is of necessity in a constant flux? Unhappily, the source from which the German propagandists draw their information is printed matter much more than social thought. George Sand donned a boy's clothes and frequented the Paris night cafes before she ventured to write her suggestive novels in Parisian life. It might help considerably to clear official Germany's views of American opinion if her New York press campaigners freely associated with statesmen and scholars, merchants and manufacturers, publishers and editors, instead of confining their living intercourse to German-American and pro-German circles. At present Berlin officials seem the substance of current opinion in the United States through a glass darkly, and cognizes fleeting shadows instead of their reality.

That the actual German propaganda in New York is a distinct failure and harmful to the German cause is admitted by its originator, Dr. Dernburg. In a letter which lies before me, he advises the New York propagandists to keep silence, though he did not practise himself when he was over here what he now preaches.

A prominent Columbia professor asked a short time ago: What is the use of turning out pamphlets by the score on every possible Allied subject to which no reasonable American will listen now since the argument comes from the opposite camp? Yet our public libraries are flooded with literature issued by Dr. Albert's New York press agency. It deals with the collapse of Russian finance, Franco-Italian abominations, the English crime of having started the war and similar matter, on which it is too early to decide one way or the other. Goethe once blamed the poets for the decadence of poetry. Is not the failure of the German propaganda in New York chiefly the fault of the clumsy methods employed by the propagandists?

Nevertheless, if Professor Munsterberg is correct in forestalling closer ties between America and Germany after the war, and in anticipating the necessity of a Germanic bond against mightily evolving Slavdom and the onrush of the swelling yellow wave, a true German propaganda which will further American as well as German, aye, Germanic, interests will be cordially welcomed by every right thinking and patriotic American. Professor Munsterberg, who never consciously alienated American sympathies, is perhaps the fittest instrument for initiating that futurist movement which, in the nature of things, can only be preparatory and tentative as long as the war lasts. The Harvard psychologist is generally respected, and affords the best proof that a man can be a loyal German without rendering himself odious to the community where he dwells as a guest. Professor Shepherd, the Columbia historian, is the best example that a loyal American citizen does not forfeit the right of sympathizing with whatever cause he considers just.

The old German propaganda is dead! Live the propaganda! ERNEST P. HORRITZ. New York, Aug. 10, 1916.